

**REMARKS**

After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 11-24 are currently pending in this application. New claims 11-24 are added via this Amendment.

**I. Formal Matters**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for initialing the references listed on Form PTO-1449 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on December 10, 2002. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his telephone call of September 20, 2004, regarding the absence of initialled Form PTO-1449 submitted with the IDS filed on August 30, 2002, in the present Office Action. Applicant looks forward to receiving a facsimile of said initialled Form PTO-1449 from the Examiner in due course. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 11-24 are all the claims pending in this application.

**II. Claims**

**A. 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

The claims 1 and 5 have been amended to reflect the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. For example, “each region” (original claim 1, 3<sup>rd</sup> par.) has been amended to “for a region specified by said second customer...” (currently amended claim 1). Accordingly,

withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1 and 5 is requested and asserted to be in order.

Claims 9 and 10 directed to a computer program and computer storage medium have been cancelled and new dependent claims 16 and 17 reflect the Examiner's suggested revisions to comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> par., by particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the inventive subject matter.

**B. 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

1. Applicant asserts that the pending claims are patentably distinguishable from *Klein*. A distinguishing feature in Applicant's independent claims is the service provided to the first customer. Applicant's claimed method and system provide the first customer with the opportunity to rent his car(s) to second customer(s) through a dealer (claims 1 and 5, [0002], [0011]). *Klein* neither suggests nor discloses a method or system for one customer to rent his vehicle through a dealer to a second customer. Applicant discloses and claims a car rental method and a corresponding system for car rental, wherein two customers are served by the renting of one car. In contrast, *Klein* is directed to an automated car rental system, requiring less customer-dealer personal interface. *Klein* fails to disclose an element of independent claims 1 and 5; therefore, asserted 35 U.S.C. §102(b) anticipation by *Klein* is inappropriate. Reconsideration of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) anticipation rejection in view of *Klein* is hereby requested. Further, dependent claims 2 and 6 (amended) and 11-24 (new) are believed to now be in condition for allowance as

depending from an allowable independent claim.

Similarly, the other prior art made of record but not applied, does not disclose or suggest a means for a customer to offer his vehicle for rent. ([www.alamo.com](http://www.alamo.com), *Williams, Hirshberg, Bishop*).

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue that the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, he is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below.

An Excess Claim Fee Payment Letter with appropriate fee accompanies this document. The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all additional required fees (except the Issue/Publication Fees) to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Amelia F. Morani, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 52,049

**SUGHRUE MION, PLLC**  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 30, 2004